

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of) Attorney Docket No.: **MIYOSH0008**
Seiichi AKAGI et al.)
Serial No.: 10/598,515) Confirmation No.: 6701
Filed: September 1, 2006) Group Art Unit: 1796
For: SEALANT EPOXY-RESIN MOLDING) Examiner: Hannah J. PAK
MATERIAL, AND ELECTRONIC)
COMPONENT DEVICE) Date: April 7, 2010

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY (E)

MAIL STOP: AMENDMENT
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

In view of the telephone interview conducted between Examiner Hannah J. Pak (571-270-5456) and Applicants' attorney, Wesley Ashton, on April 6, 2010, please enter the following remarks in the application identified above in accordance with MPEP § 713.04:

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 2 of this paper.

I. REMARKS

Examiner Hannah J. Pak contacted Applicants' attorney, Wesley Ashton, via telephone on April 6, 2010 in order to continue the Examiner's Interview conducted on April 1, 2010 between the Examiner and Applicants' attorneys (See Examiner's Interview, dated April 1, 2010). Examiner Pak informed Applicants' attorney that, upon further consideration with her supervisor, Examiner Pak has determined that JP 05-283560 issued to Nakamura et al. (hereafter, the "Nakamura Document") does not teach or suggest a dihydroanthracene compound as claimed. The Examiner informed Applicants' attorney that all rejections based on the Nakamura Document have been withdrawn. The Examiner also informed Applicants' attorney that all previous grounds of rejection have been withdrawn.


The Examiner notified Applicants' attorney about U.S. Patent 7,307,128 B2, which the Examiner contends would render unpatentable one or more claims of the above-captioned application, although the Examiner did not further explain the alleged rejection. The Examiner pointed out that U.S. Patent 7,307,128 B2, which issued December 11, 2007 from U.S. Patent Application No. 10/927,617, which was filed on August 27, 2004, could be removed as valid prior art if Applicants perfected their priority claim by filing a certified English translation of the Japanese Priority Document, JP 2004-059106, which was filed on March 3, 2004.

Applicants' attorney informed the Examiner that he would provide the Applicants with a copy of U.S. Patent 7,307,128 B2 so they may determine for themselves whether to file a certified English translation of Japanese Priority Document, JP 2004-059106. The Examiner informed Applicants' attorney that the Examiner has one to two months to act on this case if Applicants would like to perfect the foreign priority claim before the next Office Action is issued.

Questions are welcomed by the below-signed attorney for Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,

GRiffin & Szipl, P.C.



Joerg-Uwe Szipl
Registration No. 31,799

GRiffin & Szipl, P.C.
Suite PH-1
2300 Ninth Street, South
Arlington, VA 22204

Telephone: (703) 979-5700
Facsimile: (703) 979-7429
Email: gands@szipl.com
Customer No.: 24203